



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

7a  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,855	01/12/2004	Stephen J. Lippard	MTV-061.01	8425

25181 7590 03/04/2005

FOLEY HOAG, LLP  
PATENT GROUP, WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST  
155 SEAPORT BLVD  
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

KOSAR, ANDREW D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/755,855

Applicant(s)

LIPPARD ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew D Kosar

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-42 are pending and require restriction.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-35 and 42, drawn to platinum-based compounds and a kit, classified in class 424, subclass 629.
- II. Claims 36-41, drawn to a method of treating cancer with compounds of Group I, classified in class 424, subclass 629.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case one could treat cancer with a materially different compound, docetaxel.

The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the non-patented literature search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group.

Additionally, the compounds of the instant application are distinct, absent evidence to the contrary, and would require a unique search strategy. The search for the distinct compounds is conducted based on their chemical structure. Therefore, the search of one chemical structure

Art Unit: 1654

would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another structure, nor would it necessarily lead to the discovery of methods of using and/or making.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the search for one invention would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another invention, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper, and to not restrict would be an undue burden on the Examiner.

Claims 1-42 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising platinum compounds having cis-labile ligands, one or more therapeutic agents and/or targeting moieties. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

In order to effect a complete response, Applicant is required to identify a single disclosed species, wherein each ligand, agent, and/or moiety is specifically identified (e.g.- therapeutic agent is estrogen), and identify all claims readable upon the elected species. [Note: election of a generic, for example, 'steroid' for therapeutic agent, would not be considered fully responsive, as it would be an undue burden to search the myriad of compounds embraced by the generic]. For example, Applicant may choose to elect SUN-D or SUN-M (page 68, specification).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

***Election of Peptide***

Art Unit: 1654

Additionally, if Applicant elects a peptide component (e.g.- targeting moiety), Applicant is required to elect a single peptide as the peptide of the compound/composition of the method, as drawn to the elected invention, regardless of which group is elected. [Note: A generic (e.g.- peptide with arginine, etc.) may NOT be elected as drawn to the elected invention because no meaningful search can be conducted without an undue burden, due to the myriad of potential possible formulae]. The peptides claimed as targeting moieties are generic, and thus do not have a significant structural core from which a meaningful coextensive search could be conducted, thus a separate and distinct search, as well as examination, of each peptide sequence is required. In order to effect a complete response to this Office Action, Applicant is required to elect a single peptide for examination and identify claims readable upon the elected peptide, including any claims subsequently added. **This requirement is not to be taken as an election of species, but rather as an election of a single invention, since each peptide is assumed to be a patentably distinct invention, in the absence of specific, substantial, and credible evidence to the contrary.**

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

#### ***Inventorship***

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### ***Rejoinder Practice***

The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found

Art Unit: 1654

allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.


Art Unit: 1654


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew D. Kosar whose telephone number is (571)272-0913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8am-430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571)272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Andrew D. Kosar, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1654

  
**BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**